DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 668 FL 025 418

AUTHOR Gooden-Jones, Epsey M.; Carrasquillo, Angela L.
TITLE Developing English Writing Proficiency in Limited English Proficient College Students through Cooperative Learning Strategies.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Brainstorming; Classroom Techniques; Community Colleges; *Cooperative Learning; *English (Second Language); Instructional Effectiveness; *Limited English Speaking; Reading Assignments; Second Language Instruction; Skill Development; Teaching Methods; *Thinking Skills; Two Year College Students; Two Year Colleges; Writing Exercises; *Writing Instruction; Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

A study followed ten limited-English-proficient (LEP) community college students who were taught English largely using a cooperative learning approach. For four months, the students worked together using brainstorming techniques and collaborative reading and writing tasks. Task emphasis was on development of thinking skills through collaboration in whole group and pair situations. Results indicate that the cooperative learning approach improved the students' English writing skills. Eight passed the College Writing Assessment Test, and all expressed the feeling that they had improved their writing skills and viewed writing as a mode of learning. (Contains 21 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 668

DEVELOPING ENGLISH WRITING PROFICIENCY IN LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT COLLEGE STUDENTS THROUGH COOPERATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES

Carrasquillo Angela

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Epsey M. Gooden-Jones
Angela L. Carrasquillo
Fordham University

FL025418

ABSTRACT

An increased number of community colleges have adopted the open door admission policy and have attracted a large number of students who lack literacy skills in English. This situation gave rise to a number of basic remedial college courses, especially in the area of reading and writing. Research showed that the estimated proportion of entering students who are not prepared for college work ranges from 30 to 60 percent (Hennessey, 1990; Olsen 1989, 1993). Colleges, faced with the problem of maintaining academic standards, have responded by administering reading and writing placement tests to new students, and using these scores to assign students to the appropriate developmental course. College students must be proficient in English reading and writing; although writing is one of the most demanding and challenging skills for LEP college students to accomplish. Limited English proficient (LEP) college students have benefited from college policies, such as "open admissions," and today there are a growing number of adult immigrant students in American colleges. These high number of LEP college students have motivated educators to create learning strategies to develop English reading and writing proficiency for continuous success in regular college courses.

This study followed ten college LEP students in a community college who were, for the most part, taught English through a cooperative learning approach. For four months students worked together using brainstorming techniques, and collaboratively reading and writing tasks. Emphasis of tasks were on thinking skills through collaboration in whole and pair groups and products. Results of the study indicated that cooperative learning strategies improved participants' English writing. Eight participants passed the College Writing Assessment Test (CWAT). All of the participants expressed that they improved their English writing skills, and they perceived writing as a mode of learning.

DEVELOPING ENGLISH WRITING PROFICIENCY IN LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT COLLEGE STUDENTS THROUGH COOPERATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES

Research on writing emphasizes the connection between writing, thinking and learning. Writing is seen as a tool of thinking and learning (Dolly, 1990; Nightingale, 1991; Resnick & Klopfen, 1989). Thinking involves the action of using one's mind to produce thoughts within language (Smith, 1990; Villamil, 1991). Wells (1986) saw writing as a discovery of one's inner thoughts through the medium of thinking, reasoning, and communicating. Thinking is related to language as a special mental activity, of which thoughts are influenced by the language as it is expressed. Language creates imagination and enables individuals to put chunks of meaning together through the medium of thinking. Thinking also requires organization of thoughts as one creates ideas to produce facts through logical reasoning. The ability to solve problems is a way to help students to cope successfully with the experience of learning. Because writing in itself is a tool for thinking and learning, when students write, this tool helps them to learn (Nightingale, 1991; Zamel, 1993, 1982).

In many instances, LEP students do not know how to organize and structure their thoughts for writing in English. LEP students, at the early stage of writing in English, display weaknesses in sentence structure, and communicating ideas coherently with correct grammatical usage (Hennessy, 1990). Students' lack of experience with the English language serves as barriers against effective college writing. In general, these students are unable to write in English at a high thinking level (i.e.; making inferences, such as creating picture images and relating ideas for the creation of a thesis and supporting details). Therefore, instructional and learning strategies on developing English skills become a necessity to make students understand the purpose and process involved in learning to write in English and seeing writing as a mode of learning. This study addressed the issue of how, through the use of cooperative learning strategies, LEP college students' were provided with learning tools to integrate oral, and reading activities and to transfer that knowledge into the development of writing skills. Cooperative learning has been mentioned in the literature as one of those successful learning tools for developing English writing skills (Beachy, 1992; Davidson & Worsham, 1992; Zamel, 1993).

Cooperative learning strategies involve intellectual problem-solving abilities required for the task of writing (Cohen, 1990-1991, Kitszner & Mandell, 1982). Through cooperative learning, students work together as a team in the learning process which involves inquiry and discussion with peer and small groups to share ideas and work together in the accomplishments of a common learning task. Concomitantly, interactive and structured approaches help students to think and to write effectively. Students work together cooperatively in asking questions, in organizing ideas and making choices, supporting their point of view in favor of or against a particular concept, in order to write a meaningful written task. In this study, cooperative learning is defined as the willingness and the ability to work together in groups as a learning team to master academic skills (Bossert, 1990; Davidson & Worsham, 1992; Kagan, 1989-1990; Strother, 1990-1991). It is a learning strategy designed to engage students actively in the learning process through inquiry and discussion with peers in small groups (Davidson & Worsham, 1992). The groups were organized and structured carefully to advance and promote participation and learning of group members in a shared cooperative manner in which students work together on learning activities. In other words, cooperative learning is not one complete instructional system but a variety of instructional methods such as lecture, large- and small-group discussion, individual, and team learning, and peer teaching and learning. This strategy has proven to improve the academic performance of low achieving students and, at the same time, foster friendly positive intergroup relationships (Beachy, 1992; Cohen, 1986, 1990-1991; Davidson & Worsham, 1992; Dolly, 1990; Johnson & Johnson, 1987; Nightingale, 1991; Sharon, cited in Davidson & Worsham, 1992; Slavin, 1986; Strother 1990-1991). In this study, learning tasks were geared to the development of English writing.

Writing is an important part of language; it is a tool of thinking, reasoning, discovering, creating, and sharing of ideas. Writing can be a mode of learning to convey creative knowledge through various strategies (Smith, 1990; Villamil, 1991; Wells, 1986). In this study reading tasks were part of the instructional methodology. Reading and writing actively use intellectual processes as modes of learning, and writing is a self-paced activity, involving active and personal involvement. Writing engages students in a situation of meaningful contexts. These contexts are interactive, personal, informative, heuristic, and imaginative (Beachy, 1992; Kirszner & Mandell, 1982; Shanahan, 1988). When writing is seen as a means of communication, awareness of the reader's ideas is essential, and reading becomes an important source. Learning takes place when

the writer transfers that knowledge of created ideas to the reader and understanding and meanings are gained. Writing then, becomes a mode of learning to convey creative knowledge through the production of tasks.

Writing in the second language is writing taught to students whose native language is not English. Villamil (1991) and Zamel (1982) investigated the writing process of advanced English as a second language (ESL) writers from different language backgrounds at the college level. They found that students who were ready to compose, had composing behaviors similar to native speakers in the use of strategies such as students' interaction, planning and writing down ideas, students' reporting on their thinking and writing behavior, revising their work with several drafts, and focusing on proofreading as they refined their finished product. What these students did not have was the mechanical and idiomatic features of the English language to transform their native language thought into the second language thought and structure. Villamil admitted that writers need strategies for refining and transforming information into the second language. Dolly (1990) researched a multi-cultural group of students with low proficiency in English and investigated the students' awareness of the writing task during the composing process in English as a second language. Students discovered that writing and reading require awareness of, and interaction or collaboration with others by actually writing their thoughts and ideas on paper. The findings of these three studies provided background information in conducting the present study by alerting us on the necessary conditions for effective students' engagement and interest in the development of English writing tasks through cooperative learning strategies.

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to describe the process involved in the implementation of cooperative learning strategies in the development of English writing proficiency of LEP college students. The study examined, through observations, students' written essays, questionnaires, and interviews, how these students developed writing proficiency in cooperative learning settings. Students' limited English proficiency was a criteria for participating in the study. All participants were labeled "LEP students" since they had failed the required college assessment test several times. Participants volunteered to be part of a special English developmental writing class whose main purpose was helping students to enhance their English writing through the use

of cooperative learning strategies. The study analyzed ten students' English writing performance as well as their ability to use writing as a mode of learning.

In this study cooperative learning strategies involved: (a) metacognitive text-structure awareness and awareness of students' performance in peer and group settings, (b) reading/writing interaction and process writing, (c) reading/writing-based prose in both narrative and expository patterns, and (d) thinking/writing and writing/thinking processes. Writing as a mode of learning involved the learning of language and academic content through the use of different styles of writing (i. e. narrative, expository). The study addressed the following questions: (a) Do cooperative learning instructional strategies improve English writing proficiency in LEP college students? (b) How do students perceive themselves during the development of their writing in English as a second language? (c) What are students' individual experiences and attitudes toward working in small groups? (d) What types of social interactions were observed among peers in the cooperative learning classroom experiences?

The Method

The participants of the study were 10 volunteer college immigrant students identified as "limited English proficient" who were taking English as a second language (ESL) courses at a community college. These students volunteered two hours each day, twice a week, for a duration of one semester (four months). Students were chosen as a target population because they showed deficits in the English language, especially with syntax, sentence structure, organizing ideas for writing, use of appropriate punctuation, and limited English vocabulary. All ten participants had previously failed the College Writing Assessment Test (WAT) which is an indicator of college students' level of English writing skills. These students were placed in writing ESL classes for the purpose of preparing them to take and pass this writing assessment test since college students could not enroll in regular English courses (credit bearing) unless they pass this examination. Participants were explained the procedures to follow once they were chosen to participate in the study. Procedures and requirements included not to drop out during the semester, attend all sessions and be willing to work with classmates in the completion of the course assigned tasks.

Cooperative learning strategies used throughout the study included the following components: (a) reading and writing as an interconnection process, (b) learning to write by reading what other writers said and applying the content to their own writing, (c) learning to

write in different organizational patterns according to different audience needs, and (d) learning to monitor their own reading and writing processes. The content of the material used included eight short stories on international and cultural perspectives from the book *One World Many Cultures* (Hirschberg, 1992). The text was chosen in consultation with a group of professors from the College's English Department. The content of the stories revealed various cultural values, especially how these values shaped communities and affected individual lives in society. Materials also included weekly audio cassette tapes on students' interactions. Cooperative learning strategies were introduced and students were trained to use the various learning strategies introduced with each lesson. Through these strategies, participants were acquainted with each other through continuous interaction which provided a base upon which personal trust and confidence were established for success in the writing class. Students were encouraged to write a journal about their learning experiences on a daily basis and prepare a portfolio of the class activities, materials and experiences. In the journal, students kept all their writings--essays, drafts, final products, and ideas from the readings they used in their writing tasks. The journal helped students by providing daily opportunities to write and by showing differences between formal and informal writing.

The reading/writing phase of the treatment was introduced to the students; however the reading materials from the text, were chosen by the group. The readings were done prior to the writing sessions. Participants were divided in two groups consisting of five students in each group. Before writing, students were allowed to discuss the articles/readings and relate these readings to their own experiences or other related experiences. The trainer questioned individual participants to check for comprehension of the story, and participants made comments on the content and the structure of the readings, especially, what they found common to their own experiences or the experiences of others. From the readings, questions were drawn for writing development and preparation of individual and group written essays. The cooperative learning strategy was used to explore and generate ideas for writing individual and group essays.

The writing process involved discussion and understanding of the finished task. During the writing process, participants discussed specific questions related to the topic, wrote down ideas, and organized them. Participants were encouraged to interact and to establish a rapport among themselves and the topic. Once individual and work trust was developed, students worked to the

highest level of academic performance and enthusiasm. Some interactive learning strategies used offered competition among the groups which led students to work for success.

FINDINGS

The study addressed four areas: (a) the LEP college students' performance on English writing, (b) their self-perception of growth of English, and involvement in cooperative learning strategies, (c) attitudes toward working collaboratively, and (d) the types of social interactions developed through cooperative learning. The next paragraphs addresses each of these issues.

Does the Use of Cooperative Learning Strategies Contribute to the Improvement of English Language Proficiency?

Participants used a variety of cooperative learning strategies as modes of thinking and learning within group and peer settings. Data from all 10 participants think aloud protocols, journals, and interviews indicated that although 90% of the participants had no previous involvement with cooperative learning strategies, after several opportunities of interacting with the text, writing down ideas, and sharing these ideas in writing with their groups and peers, they gained confidence in each other. Participants improved their English writing skills. At the end of the semester essays were longer, ideas were well-structured. Essays followed a logical sequence. The analysis of all data indicated that the cooperative learning strategies helped the ten participants to engage in a series of learning tasks which contributed to the improvement and development of English language proficiency. Table 1 shows participants' results of the pre-post-test Writing Assessment Test (WAT) and indicates that students improved their English language skills. Of the ten participants, eight (80%) passed the WAT at the end of the semester.

Table 1: Participants' Pre- and Post-Results of the Writing Skills Assessment Test.

Participants	Pretest	Posttest
A	1	4
B	2	4
C	3	5
D	3	6
E	2	4
F	3	6
G	1	3*
H	2	3*
I	2	5
J	2	6

Note: N = 10 Passing score: 4 or more
Fail score: 3 or less

Data indicated that the sharing of ideas and tasks contributed to participants' English language development. At the beginning, participants were reluctant to discuss and share their essays, however as the class progressed they lost their fear, and developed friendly relationships among themselves which contributed to learning to write in English.

What Learning Strategies Participants Used the Most?

Ten different strategies were frequently used. Table 2 summarizes the cooperative learning strategies most used by participants and the frequency level (high, average and low). Strategies used by the participants indicated that thinking strategies used during comprehending the story were related to understanding of the problem, the planning, drafting, revising, and editing stages.

Table 2: Learning Strategies Used by participants During the Composing Process: Number of Times Per Strategy.

	Strategies										Number of Students		
Participants	I	GI	FM	R	E	UPE	Ad	ATM	Ag	S	H	Av	L
A	H	Av	L	L	L	Av	L	L	Av	Av	1	4	5
B	Av	L	H	L	Av	Av	Av	L	H	Av	2	5	3
C	L	H	L	H	L	H	L	L	H	Av	4	1	5
D	L	Av	L	Av	L	H	Av	L	H	L	2	3	5
E	H	H	L	Av	Av	H	Av	Av	Av	H	4	5	1
F	Av	H	Av	H	H	H	Av	Av	H	H	6	4	0
G	Av	Av	H	H	H	Av	H	Av	H	H	6	4	0
H	H	Av	L	Av	H	H	L	L	H	Av	4	3	3
I	H	H	Av	Av	Av	H	H	L	H	H	6	3	1
J	H	Av	H	Av	L	H	H	Av	H	H	6	3	1
N = 10									Average		4.1	3.5	2.4

H = high (31-40 times)
Av = average (11-30 times)
L = low (10 or fewer times)

I = interacting
GI = generating ideas
FM = formulating meaning
R = reasoning
E = evaluating sentences
UPE = using personal experiences
Ad = advising
ATM = attending to mechanics
Ag = agreeing
S = sharing

Although participants used a variety of learning strategies, six participants (E, F, G., H, I, J) used the strategies of reasoning, evaluating sentences, advising, and attending to mechanics frequently. However, as Table 2 indicates there was no preference for one strategy over the other. When talking about the content of the story, and preparation for the writing phase, participants frequently used strategies such as interacting, generating ideas, formulating meaning, reasoning, evaluating sentences, using personal experiences, advising, attending to mechanics, agreeing, and sharing ideas. It was observed that participants with better English language proficiency helped those with less English experience in the areas of mechanics, sentence structure, formulating meanings, and generating ideas.

How did Participants Feel about Using Cooperative Learning?

Perceptions of the participants' own personal experiences in writing showed similarities in their writing development as they experienced the process of discovering and exploring ideas, and constructing these ideas in a framework to produce a finished product. Participants expressed the idea that they improved their writing with the reading reader-based prose activities. As Table 3 indicates, participants expressed that by practicing learning sentence structures, and grammar, they develop new vocabulary and organization of ideas and these strategies improved their writing.

Table 3: Participants' Responses on their Perceptions of Writing as a Mode of Learning.

Participants	Questionnaire 1 (Pre) (Maximum Score 3)	Questionnaire 2 (Post) (Maximum Score 3)
A	1	3
B	2	3
C	1	2
D	3	2
E	3	3
F	1	2
G	3	3
H	3	3
I	1	1
J	1	3
Average	1.9	2.5

Note: 1 = low perception of writing as a mode of learning; 2 = moderate perception of writing as a mode of learning; 3 = high perception of writing as a mode of learning.

Collaborating with other students exposed participants to the English language, and they, in turn, become better learners by applying what they have learned.

Students expressed that the sharing of tasks and ideas motivated them and produced better written products. Table 4 lists the variety of strategies they used.

Table 4: Type and Frequency of Sharing Strategies Used in the Writing Tasks

	Group 1 Frequency (Times Used)	Group 2 Frequency (Times Used)
Think aloud-pair-share	20	25
Small group interaction	23	28
Partnership involvement	21	28
Peer reviewing	28	29
Peer editing/peer check	25	26
Team learning	29	27
Team information sharing	29	27
Jigsaw	20	25
Number of heads together	25	24
Small group sharing	15	18
Meditation-thinking	5	6
Average	21	24

Note: Maximum number of strategies = 30.

During peer editing, participants shared ideas with each other, questioned sentence structures, and asked meanings of written statements; they paraphrased, responded to ideas, and gave appropriate praise. The following are comments from students' journals and interviews:

> To me, these activities bring us together; we share our different views from our different cultures. We learn from each other. When we know about others' cultures, we live better in our community, it lessens racial problems in our society. (Student H)

> By working together, I found out that it was the greatest help to me. Interacting with other students really helped me a lot. That was the best part of the course. By working together I learned a lot from other students. (Student A)

As Table 5 indicates, participants used a variety of reading and writing strategies which may have been useful in their completion of group and individual tasks.

Table 5: Use of Reading/Writing Interface Strategies During the Interaction, Composing, Sharing, Revising, and Editing Stages

Task/Stage	Interaction	Composing	Sharing	Revising	Editing	Frequency of Students' Use of Strategy
GI	8	26	20	20	20	88
OP	15	8	75	7	8	13
PD	12	12	10	12	12	58
RRE	10	15	10	10	10	55
UPE	8	8	3	5	8	32
ES	8	10	6	15	5	53
RS	15	10	5	5	5	49
Q	15	8	8	4	9	44
TI	16	10	7	8	8	49
TS	16	10	8	8	8	50
EF	4	8	8	8	7	35
UODAE	8	8	8	5	8	34
LTAI	5	10	8	7	8	38
AIM	4	5	8	8	8	33
A	5	5	8	2	8	28
Average of times used	9.9	10.2	12.8	8.2	8.8	43.9

Note: Participants wrote a total of 10 essays
N= 10 Participants

GI = Generating Ideas
OP = Organizing Paragraphs
PD = Paragraph Development
RRE = Revising and Restructuring Essay
UPE = Using Personal Experience
ES = Essay Synthesis
RS = Reorganizing Sentences
Q = Questioning
TI = Title Identification
TS = Thesis Statement
EF = Essay Format
UODAE = Use of Details and Examples
LTAI = Leading to Audience's Interest
AIM = Attending to Mechanics
A = Advising

What Types of Social Interactions Were Observed?

Socially, students benefited by interacting among themselves in the completion of the reading/writing tasks. Table 5 presents the frequency of students interactive activities. As the data indicate, students' interacted during the completion of reading and writing tasks. Social interactions included general discussions, sharing of ideas, listening to participant's thoughts, and constructive feedback in the process of completing all tasks.

Students' perceptions was that learning was promoted as a social process to share cultural values while interacting with each other orally and in writing. Participants expressed that they learned to appreciate each others efforts during editing and revising of their essays and that the friendly atmosphere helped them to become more productive and better writers. This finding is in agreement with Davidson and Worsham (1992) that working together as a team allowed students to master academic content and social skills.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this case study of ten college LEP participants suggest that cooperative learning as a mode of instruction facilitates learning and may contribute to improve English language development. The study used a variety of cooperative learning strategies during the composing and revising segments, including questioning techniques until students learned the art of questioning themselves during interaction. In the design of the various cooperative learning strategies, participants worked together as a learning team to share ideas to master the writing skills through inquiry and discussion with peers and in small groups. At the beginning, participants experienced difficulty in writing in English; they had ideas but they could not organize and structure them on paper. As they practiced interacting with each other (from the text and with the use of cooperative learning strategies, working in small groups and pairs), they discovered that their thinking ability improved as well as their writing.

Interactive learning approaches helped these ten participants to think and write. These strategies allowed them to understand assignments, collect and organize details, and compose drafts, write, and share products for constructive comments. During the study, participants were trained in the use of cooperative learning strategies during the writing phases of reorganizing, drafting, revising, and editing. At the beginning, participants were reluctant to share their ideas, but as the study progressed, participants provided support to each other. They wrote, revised, and agreed with each other, and reasoned their way to solving the problems of writing. Participants examined their own experiences, the problems and challenges became clearer for writing. The process allowed them to make sense of their essays and they found answers for the various areas of the writing that needed help. Participants spent much time understanding the topic, and generating and organizing ideas for writing. The reading/thinking/writing strategy was used as a technique to engage participants cooperatively in learning. The process approach to

writing was effective because it emphasized writing as a means of producing a final product. Sensenbaugh (1990) stressed this same process approach to writing.

The findings reveal that cooperative learning strategies helped participants make gains in writing. At the beginning of the study, writing was difficult for all the participants. At the conclusion of the study all participants were able to write in English. Cooperative learning strategies that included the use of several strategies changed participants' learning and writing styles as well as their social attitudes toward each other's ways of learning. They learned to respect and appreciate each other's ideas, developed a friendly atmosphere among themselves, and made progress in writing. As the study progressed, students became more concerned with making their essays more meaningful as they become aware of themselves as authors as well as the audience for which they wrote. The noticeable change in the participants' knowledge of essay writing showed that activities of writing used as a mode of learning, along with the cooperative learning strategies, served as a catalyst to change students' knowledge, writing structure, and attitudes toward writing in English. The cooperative learning strategies for writing and writing as a tool for learning caused students to read and to think about ideas and events which helped to tap inner sources of previous knowledge. Writing together in small groups and with peers was seen as a necessary approach to develop good writing skills.

The results of this study have practical implications for educators to improve instructional practices regarding the teaching of writing to limited English proficient college students. The learning which took place in this study included several instructional strategies, such as verbal interaction, small group and peer teaching and learning, modes of thinking and learning, structural approach, text structure awareness and awareness of behavior, the reading/thinking/writing interface, and process writing. Instruction that incorporates groups and peers working together are successful instructional tools from which second language learners learn from each other. Through these strategies, second language learners exchange ideas, learn new content and vocabulary, essay structure, get an understanding of the language they are learning, and they experiment freely with discussing new concepts of writing.

The results of this study affirms that ESL college students can learn to write, preferably through small groups and peers. Students working cooperatively can arrive at solutions, and by sharing their work they learn to develop and refine their skills (Resnick & Klopfer, 1989) and writing might be used as a tool of learning. However, it is important for educators to understand

that second language students have difficulty in writing in Engl'sl and responding to instruction to help them learn. One strategy is not enough to assist LEP s udents to improve thier English language skills; educators should reflect on a variety of strategies to help students to improve their writing in the second language. Writing requires time; therefore, much time should be allotted to the teaching of writing. Writing requires much practice and the use of teacher-student conferences regularly is recommended to develop proficiency.

References

Beachy, C. J. (1992). Enhancing writing through cooperative peer editing. In N. Davidson & T. Worsham (Eds.), *Enhancing thinking through cooperative learning* (pp. 209-220). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bossert, S. T. (1990). Cooperative activities in the classroom. In E. Z. Rothkopf, *Research in education* (Vol. 15, pp. 225-246). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Cohen, E. G. (1990-1991). Continuing to cooperate: Prerequisites for persistence. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*, 134-138.

Davidson, N. & Worsham, T. (1992). *Enhancing thinking through cooperating learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dolly, M. R. (1990). Integrating ESL reading and writing through authentic discourse. *Journal of Reading, 33* (55), 360-365.

Hennessy, J. H. (1990). At-risk community college students and a reading improvement course: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Reading, 34*, 536-539.

Hirschberg, S. (1992). *One World many cultures*. New York: Macmillan.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. (1987). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative competitive and individualistic learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kagan, S. (1989-1990). The structure approach to cooperative learning. In *Educational Leadership* (pp. 23-28). San Juan, Capistramo, CA: Director Resources for Teachers, Paseo Espada.

Kirszner, L. G. & Mandell, S. R. (1982). *Basic college writing*. New York: Norton.

Nightingale, P. (1991). Speaking of student writing. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 15*, 3-13.

Resnick, L. B. & Klopfer, L. E. (1989). *Toward the thinking curriculum: Current cognitive research* (1989 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum development). Washington, DC: ASCD Yearbook Publication.

Shanahan, R. (1988). The reading-writing relationship: Seven instructional principles. *Reading Teacher, 41*, 630-647.

Slavin, R. (1980). Cooperative learning. *Review of Educational Research, 50*, 315-342.

Smith, F. (1986). *Understanding reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Smith, F. (1990). *To think*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Strother, D. B. (1990-1991). Cooperative: Fad or foundation for learning. Practical applications of research. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*, 158-162.

Villamil, O. I. (1991). *The effects of two metacognitive strategies on intermediate ESL college students' writing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, New York.

Wells, G. (1986). *The meaning makers: Children learning language and using language to learn*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*, 81-90.

Zamel, V. (1993). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*, 165-187.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE